DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 195 104 EC 131 337

AUTHOR Lawrenson, Gary: McKinnon, Archie J.
TITLE Attrition, Burnout, and Job Satisfactions of Teachers of the Emotionally Disabled.
PUB DATE Aug 80
NOTE 29p.: Paper presented at a Topical Conference of The Council for Exceptional Children (Minneapolis, MN, August, 1980, Section Meeting 2).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Demography: Elementary Secondary Education: *Emotional Disturbances: Exceptional Child Research: Faculty Mobility: *Job Satisfaction: Special Education Teachers: *Teacher Attitudes: *Teacher Morale
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Burnout

ABSTRACT

The study surveyed 33 teachers of the emotionally disabled to obtain information to help in teacher recruitment and to learn about teacher attrition and burnout. Demographic data identified teacher characteristics. Data gathered included job satisfactions, dissatisfactions, and reasons for leaving the job. A followup structured telephone interview was conducted to gain additional information and to clarify initial findings of the study. Major areas of dissatisfaction included: tired of hassles with the administration, inconsistent support staff, clerical and paper work, and lack of recognition for a job well done. A major area of satisfaction was that teachers derive satisfaction from student relationships and student growth. Major reasons for leaving the job were the same as the major dissatisfactions. Interview forms are appended. (Author/SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED195104

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED CONFERENCE PAPER

ATTRITION, BURNOUT, AND JOB SATISFACTIONS OF TEACHERS OF THE EMOTIONALLY DISABLED

Gary M. Lawrenson, M.A.
Behavior Design Instructor
Grant Wood Area Education Agency
4401 Sixth St., S.W.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404

and

Archie J. McKinnon, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Division of Special Education
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

August 1, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Archie McKinnon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head:
Attrition, Burnout

EC 131337

Gary M. Lawrenson, M.A.
Behavior Design Instructor
Grant Wood Area Education Agency
4401 Sixth St., S.W.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404

Archie J. McKinnon, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Division of Special Education
College of Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

ATTRITION, BURNOUT, AND JOB SATISFACTIONS OF TEACHERS OF THE EMOTIONALLY DISABLED

INTRODUCTION

The passage of Public Law (P.L.) 94-142 in 1975 at the federal level, mandating appropriate educational programs for handicapped students, increased the need for teachers of handicapped students. One of the handicapping areas, emotional disability, has had unusual difficulty in recruiting teachers. This difficulty has caused state departments of education to issue temporary teaching approvals, and generate recruiting programs. At the local area education level, it seemed important to consider the problem by designing and conducting a two-strand study. The first strand would provide data on the characteristics of the present teachers of the emotionally disabled. This would be a beginning effort in the direction of learning the most appropriate population for recruitment efforts. Rudloff (1969) conducted a study which suggested that individuals drawn to the vocation of teaching vary according to the specialty involved. He concluded that clarifying the characteristics of successful practitioners in the various teaching specialties would facilitate more realistic recruitment of candidates.

The second strand would deal with the problem of attrition in this teaching area. The attrition of teachers of emotionally disabled students has been described as high as 30 percent per year.

A review of the literature showed "burnout" as a heavy factor in attrition. "Burnout" has first been seen in other helping professions, however, more recently has been identified as a factor of concern to the teaching profession. W. A. McGuire, NEA president in 1979, indicated that burnout was reaching epidemic proportions in the teaching profession, causing thousands of

teachers to leave their jobs in order to preserve their health. He states that the number of teachers with 20 years or more experience has dropped by nearly half in the past 15 years (McGuire, 1979). At the other end of the age continuum, Cherness (1974) believes that it is during the first two years of a public professional's career that the institution he works for has its greatest and most lasting impact on his attitudes and behaviors. He calls on training institutions to prepare teachers for the conflicts and stresses they will meet on the job. In a later article, Cherness (1978) notes some of the factors that cause conflicts and stresses such as: isolation from colleagues, lack of feedback, lack of participation in decision making and administrators. He says that frequent complaints made about even the best supervisors are that they don't give the workers enough support and feedback, and they tend to focus on the task and rarely help the worker think about his emotional responses to the task.

Special education teachers and more specifically, teachers of the emotionally disabled, are especially vulnerable to these factors since they deal with the impact of the student with emotional disabilities on peers, other professionals, adminstrators, and themselves as teachers.

THE PROBLEM:

Therefore, we saw the problem as twofold: (1) what are the characteristics of teachers of the emotionally disabled; and, (2) what are some of the factors that can cause satisfaction and dissatisfaction with their job situation. Answers to these questions could permit a more knowledgeable recruitment effort and a more specifically directed effort to decrease teacher attrition and "burnout".

DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to survey teachers of the emotionally disabled within the Grant Wood Area Education Agency service area. The Grant Wood AEA serves a seven-county area and is one of the fifteen AEA's across the state which were created by the 1974 Iowa Legislature to offer local schools programs and services that could not be feasibly or efficiently provided on their own. As Grant Wood AEA is a tax-supported organization, most services and staff members are available to help local schools without charge. Advisory committees of local school administrators, teachers and representatives from other educational institutions participate in planning the AEA's programs. The AEA budget, staffing and services must be approved annually by its nine-member Board of Directors and the State Board of Public Instruction.

The survey questionnaire form was constructed by the investigators to provide questions in seven areas. These are: personal data, employment experience, teacher preparation, reasons for leaving a job, job support services, useful theories of teaching or behavior change, job satisfactions and dissatisfactions. The survey questions were generated by the investigators and followed ideas about job satisfactions and job dissatisfactions discussed by Sergiovanni (1967). The survey questions were reviewed by two supervisors of programs for the emotionally disabled and revised following their suggestions. The survey questionnaire was then completed by two teachers of the emotionally disabled and revised again following their suggestions. The forms were then mailed to the study subjects. These were teachers who had taught in classes which are served by the Emotional Disabilities Team of the Grant Wood Area Education Agency during the 1977-1980 school years. Classes were primarily in public schools in the area; however, three classes were not in public schools. One of these was in a detention center, one in a shelter care center, and one in a general hospital psychiatric ward. The teachers for the public

school classes were required to have temporary or full approval from the Department of Public Instruction to teach students with emotional disabilities. Teachers of two classrooms outside the public schools were not required to have E.D. approval; however, the general hospital classroom teacher does need approval.

Survey forms were mailed to 40 teachers and 33 (83 percent) returned them. This population included 14 (42 percent) teachers who had resigned from their positions and 19 (58 percent) teachers who continued employment in their positions.

The results of the survey questionnaires were compiled and a structured telephone interview form was designed to ask teachers about the main areas noted as satisfactions and dissatisfactions. The results were also compiled and summarized as percentages for comparison.

Comparisons were made between the group who resigned and the group who remain employed.

RESULTS

The study included 33 teachers of the emotionally disabled. The response from these teachers represent an 83 percent return of the 40 survey forms originally mailed. The 33 teachers include 14 (42 percent) who have resigned from their teaching jobs for a variety of reasons. These teachers are Group A. Nineteen (58 percent) teachers who plan to continue as E.D. teachers in the Grant Wood area will be referred to as Group B. The two groups of teachers are treated separately only when the data indicates there are differences between them.

As might be expected there are 29 (88 percent) female teachers and four (12 percent) male teachers. The survey shows 22 (67 percent) teachers in the 21-to-30 year range; seven (21 percent) in the 21-to-40 range; three (nine

percent) in the 41-to-50 range; and one (three percent) teacher in the over 50 age range. The teachers have the following education preparation:

TABLE 1
EDUCATION PREPARATION
of E.D. TEACHERS

Preparation	Group A (resigned)		Group B (still employed)		Total Group	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
B.A./B.S.	5	36	11	58	16	49
B.A.+	3	21	2	11	5	15
M.A.	6	43	6	31	12	36

Teachers who complete their educational programs in Iowa can obtain full certification in emotional disabilities at either the B.A. or M.A. level, depending on which college or university is attended.

The higher percentage of teachers with B.A./B.S. and B.A.+ preparation is notable in the group of teachers who have remained within the Grant Wood area, as is the higher percentage of teachers with M.A. degrees within the group of teachers who have resigned from their E.D. positions.

The need for teachers of emotionally disabled students has increased the number of temporary teaching certificates offered. The teachers in this survey group included only 17 (52 percent) teachers fully certified to teach the emotionally disabled. Table 2 illustrates the differences between Group A and Group B on this variable.

TABLE 2
E.D. TEACHER CERTIFICATION

Certification	Group A (resigned)		Group B (still employed)		Total Group	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Temporary E.D.	7	50	4	21	11	33
Full E.D.	5	36	12	63	17	52
Other (Gen. Ed., M.R.)	2	14	3	16	5	15

A high percentage (63 percent) of teachers who have remained in the Grant Wood area are fully certified.

The 33 teachers had been teaching for a median of 4.0 years with a range of 0-to-19 years before entering the area of E.D. They have been teaching E.D. for a median of 1.0 years with a range from 0-to-4 years. These data indicate the experience of many of the teachers before entering the E.D. area. The data also emphasizes the short time that many of the teachers have been in the E.D. field, and reflects the fact that many E.D. classrooms have been in existance for only a few years in the Grant Wood area.

The teachers in Group A (resigned) were asked to rank order possible reasons for leaving the job. The first three rankings were then assigned weights of rank in which choice 1=3 points, choice 2=2 points, choice 3=1 point and the weightings were added. The possible reasons for leaving the job are summarized in Table 3.

TABLE 3
REASONS FOR LEAVING THE JOB (N=14)

Reasons	Sum of Weighted Rankings
- Tired of hassles with administration	17
- Better job	15
- Moved to be closer to family	10
- Unable to have long term effect on student due to outside influences	7
- Poor facilities	6
- Better paying position	5
- Tired of meeting students' needs	3
- Desire to raise children	3
- Return to school	3
- Stress	1
- Hassle with parents	1

"Tired of hassles with the administration", "better job", and "move to be closer to family" are the most often chosen reasons. The other reasons provide critical variables for consideration when working to improve programs for students with emotional disabilities and their teachers. Two possible reasons that are conspicuous by their absence are "fear of assault by student" and "tired of day-to-day hassles with students". The absence of these reasons, plus comments regarding job satisfactions, suggests that E.D. teachers had positive relationships with their students.

All the teachers were asked to rank possible job satisfactions. The same format was used as noted above for "reasons for leaving". The first three

rankings were given a weighting of 1=3 points, 2=2 points; 3=1 point, and then the weightings were added of all the teachers for each "satisfaction". Table 4 summarizes these weightings for Groups A and B and for the total group.

TABLE 4
JOB SATISFACTIONS

Satisfactions	Sum of Weighted Rankings		
	Group A (resigned)	Group B (still employed)	Total Group
- Relationship with students	27	39	66
- Self-Achievement on the job	17	22	39
- Staff interaction	17	16	33
- Reliable and effective teacher aide	11	18	29
- Flexibility of scheduling and activities	6	20	26
- Income	7	14	21
- Summer and holiday vacation	7	14	21
- Recognition for a job well done	0	20	20
- Consistent staff support	4	14	18
- Administrative support	4	14	18
- Parent contact	7	4	11
- Clerical/paper work	0	5	5

"Relationship with students" is the most prominent job satisfaction. It is interesting to note the difference between Group A and B, as Group B ranks fairly high "recognition for a job well done" and Group A does not rank this item high enough to make the chart. It is probably a safe assumption to

make that one group received more recognition than the other for a "job well done". When all the teachers rank ordered job dissatisfactions, there were some interesting findings which are illustrated in Table 5.

TABLE 5
JOB DISSATISFACTIONS

Dissatisfactions	Sum of Weighted Rankings		
	Group A (resigned)	Group B (still employed)	Total Group
- Lack of Administration support	18	9	27
- Inconsistent support staff	15	6	21
- Clerical and paper work	6	15	21
- Lack of Recognition for a job well done	15	4	19
- Parent contact	2	11	13
- Income	4	7	11
- Staff interaction	2	6	8
- Self-Achievement	6	0	6
- Inflexibility of scheduling and activities	4	0	4
- Unreliable teacher aide	4	0	4
- Relationship with students	3	0	3

"Lack of administrative support" is listed as the number one job dissatisfaction. This is especially relevant since "tired of hassles with the administration" is listed as the major reason for leaving the job. The first four items under job dissatisfactions are within the direction of the administration and can be listed as variables of major administrative concern when evaluating E.D. programs.

STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

As noted in the procedures section, the first three items most heavily weighted as job satisfactions and the first four items most heavily weighted as job dissatisfactions were used in structured telephone interviews with 17 (52 percent) teachers who had returned the survey forms. Efforts were made to have the teachers clarify their understanding of the items used and comparisons were made between Groups A and B.

Satisfactions

When asked to clarify "relationships with students", no difference was evident between the teachers in the two groups. Many teachers described "relationships with students" as the formation of meaningful, caring, and trusting relationships, that permitted them to help a student improve.

These findings agree with Lortie (1975) and Sergiovanni (1967), who point out that psychic gratifications are a viable reward base for teachers. Sergiovanni (1967) indicates in his study that most of the teacher achievement-centered stories involved less concrete evidence of actual success and more sensing and feeling by teachers that students had been reached and were presumably affected in some positive way.

The response of teachers to questions about the second source of satisfaction used in the structured telephone interview, "self-achievement", shows they use "student growth" as a measure of their achievement. The teachers described their feeling of "self-achievement" as "helping a student achieve" both academically and in the management of his/her behavior. Lortie (1975) says that a major teacher satisfaction is the interaction that the teacher has with individual students and classes where the teacher perceives that something has happened. The teacher senses or believes that, as a result of his/her activity, a change has taken place in the student or class. There is no difference between Group A and Group B on response to this satisfier.

Responses strongly indicated teachers perceived "self-achievement" and "relationships with students" to be closely related items.

The third source of satisfaction discussed in the structured telephone interview, "staff interaction", showed that teachers considered staff interaction to include interaction with regular clasroom teachers, special education teachers in the building, visiting support staff, and administration. The staff interaction tended to be more oriented to interaction with the regular teachers in the building. This interaction was a time for sharing of ideas with regular classroom teachers about the activities in the E.D. classroom and to help them understand the actions of the E.D. students.

Dissatisfactions

There were four items used in the structured interviews regarding dissatisfactions: lack of administrative support, inconsistent support staff, clerical and paper work, and lack of recognition for a job well done.

The telephone responses to clarifying the meaning of "lack of administrative support" show this to be a higher concern item for teachers from Group A. Lack of effective communication was a major problem area. The teachers were especially concerned with their direct supervisors who might be a lead teacher, principal, or supervisor. Some teachers perceived the administrator to listen to the teachers' expressed needs and not to follow-up or give any feedback later regarding requests.

The second source of dissatisfaction was "inconsistent support staff". The most often mentioned concern was a need to have the roles of support staff clarified and coordinated, so as to eliminate confusion about who does what and when. The fact that support staff members, at times, did not keep appointments, or appointment times were not consistent, were dissatisfactions for the teachers. Dissatisfaction with the support staff was more often cited by teachers in Group A (resigned).

The third major source of dissatisfaction, "clerical and paper work", carried the usual comments about time and energy spent writing Individual

Education Programs (IEP's). The usefulness of the IEP was questioned by some teachers whereas others indicated they were useful for programming, but wanted some way to decrease the time needed for writing them.

The fourth major dissatisfaction, "lack of recognition", scored high in Group A (resigned), who felt they received no or little recognition. The primary person from whom they would have liked to have recognition was their direct supervisor, although support staff and parents were also mentioned. Group B teachers, by enlarge, felt that lack of recognition was not a problem, and several teachers even said they didn't expect much because it was inherent in the job not to get much positive feedback. These teachers seem to reflect Sarason (1971) who called public school teaching a "lonely profession." One teacher suggested that recognition could be enhanced by providing administrators, parents, and peer teachers with information and materials that invited positive responses.

It is useful to remember when discussing teacher dissatisfactions that Lortie (1975) found in his study that teachers try to eliminate or are dissatisfied with any factors that interfere with the time they can spend in direct student-teacher interaction.

DISCUSSION

The study effort to learn demographic commonalities of teachers of the emotionally disabled, that would permit designation of a target population for recruitment, gained only limited data. It is not possible to give a description of a person to hire or look for as an E.D. teacher. However, some suggestions are possible. The Group B teachers, who have continued employment, are younger in age and have a higher percentage of B.A. degree graduates than the Special Education teacher population of the largest school system within the Grant Wood area. These factors may be due to the fact that E.D. programs have been in existence only a short time and more teachers are available to recruitment at the B.A. level. The percentage of male to

female teachers, at a ratio o ut 1:7 is slightly higher than the ratio of 1:10 for the larger schoo tem population. This may indicate a small trend increase in the percentage of men entering the E.D. teaching field.

The Group B teachers include a higher percentage of teachers than the Group A teachers with full E.D. approval. This suggests full approval decreases attrition or resignation.

The attrition within this population was 42 percent, which seems high. Fourteen of the 33 teachers resigned during the three-year period. It is important to consider that the attrition may be related to the fact that these are new programs, new teachers, and a new support team. Some change and adjustment is expected in any new endeavor.

Although the data does not show that the teachers who resigned suffered from "burnout" as described by Cherness (1978), Maslach (1978), or Pines and Kafry (1978), the reasons the teachers cited for leaving and their dissatisfactions contain possible burnout content.

The concern with the lack of support from administration was noted so often, and specifically, that their comments do not seem to agree with Lortie (1975), who says teachers see principals and others as hindering and intrusive. His study suggested that teachers were very individualistic and had difficulty becoming involved with team efforts. These teachers saw a need for assistance and support from administration and wanted more interaction and consistent communication.

Concerns expressed by the surveyed teachers interviewed by telephone are similar to those cited as fertile to "burnout". The teachers indicated a lack of consistency of the E.D. Team members. Specifically mentioned items were lack of role clarification, occasional failure to keep appointments, late for appointments, and disagreement among team members regarding educational strategies.

Other factors such as poor facilities, and lack of materials add stresses in a "burnout" direction.

The teachers in the study were definite in their satisfaction with student-teacher relations. They like to work with the students and generate growth and improvement. Their comments indicate that they are aware that they need to do other things, too, to gain satisfactions for themselves, since working with E.D. students requires a heavy investment with minimal feedback, a certain burnout direction.

The comments about the need for recognition were described realistically as suggestions were noted that a brief memo encouraging or complimenting a teacher on a specific improvement, a verbal comment, and a visit to the E.D. classroom would take only a brief amount of supervisory or administrative time.

CONCLUSIONS

The demographic data from the study showed these E.D. teachers to be similar to other special education teachers in terms of ratio of males to females, educational preparation, and age level. As a group, these teachers had little experience in Emotional Disabilities, and had been recruited into newly established programs. The study was not able to distinguish an E.D. teacher profile to use to target a population for recruitment. The fact that a higher percentage of teachers who continued in their E.D. positions were fully certified to teach E.D. students, supports the emphasis on a need for more fully certified E.D. teachers.

This survey extends and supports the findings described by Sergiovanni (1967) that satisfiers for teachers are related to the work itself and dissatisfiers are related to the conditions or environment of work. The teachers in this study noted the major satisfiers as work related. "Relationship with a student" and "self-achievement on the job" were rated highest. These two items are closely related to each other in the thinking of the teachers. Gaining a positive relationship with a student is a measure of self-achievement for the teachers.

The dissatisfiers, on the other hand, focused on conditions and people which surround the actual work. Sergiovanni (1967) notes that an environment relatively free of dissatisfactions will tend to increase the appearance of factors which are direct contributors to job satisfactions. He notes that dissatisfaction factors identified for teachers tend to focus on conditions and circumstances that teachers expect to be maintained at acceptable levels. The teacher should expect fair and consistent administrative actions, supportive school policies, pleasant working conditions, and positive interpersonal relationships. The implications of the study are similar to those of Sergiovanni. An emphasis on supportive supervision, effective communication, consistent support staff, and a reduction in clerical or paper work are important considerations. They will tend to decrease the job dissatisfactions. There should also be some work-related changes. These will increase the impact of the job satisfiers. This is done by increasing opportunities for teachers to achieve personal and professional success. This can be done by increasing the teachers' autonomy, permitting the teachers' opportunities to increase their professional skills, and providing them with recognition for successful student-teacher oriented behavior. Since student-teacher behavior is satisfying to teachers, it is rewarding to them. This is an internal motivator. If this is paired with satisfying external factors, such as recognition and support, a major step has been made toward providing the teacher with a positive work situation.

SUMMARY

The study was designed to provide information useful for recruitment of teachers of the emotionally disabled and information useful for reducing attrition of teachers of the emotionally disabled.

Survey forms were sent to 40 E.D. teachers who had been employed within the Grant Wood Area Education Agency service during the 1977-78, 1978-79, 1979-80 school years. Thirty-three (83 percent) forms were returned. The teachers who returned the forms are the subjects for the study. Within this group 14 teachers (42 percent) had resigned and 19 teachers (58 percent) continued as E.D. teachers.

These two groups were compared during the study and major differences are reported. Commonalities for the total group, as compared to all special educators in the largest school district within the Grant Wood service area, include the ratio of male to female teachers (about 1:7), the high percentage of teachers in the 21-to-30 age range (67 percent), and the high percentage of teachers with B.A. degree preparation (64 percent). When teacher certification was considered, the group of teachers who had resigned had a higher percentage (50 percent) of teachers with temporary E.D. certification than the teachers in Group B (teachers still employed). The teachers in Group B had only 21 percent with temporary E.D. certification.

The teacher who resigned rank ordered "reasons for resigning" and the following three reasons were the most often chosen and emphasized: "tired of hassles with the administration", "better job", "moved to be closer to family". The teachers were asked to rank order job satisfactions and job dissatisfactions. The job satisfactions receiving the highest rankings were "relationship with students", "self-achievement on the job", and "staff interaction". The job dissatisfactions receiving the highest rankings were "lack of administrative support", "inconsistent support staff", "clerical and paper work", and "lack of recognition for a job well done".

These seven items were used as a basis for a structured telephone interview with a random sample of the teachers. The teachers were asked to clarify and expand on the meaning of each of the items and how they were a satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The differences that we found between Group A and Group B were the same as those found on the survey questionnaire.

The major findings of the study are referenced to the two strands noted in the introduction. The demographic data did not permit the development of a profile of an E.D. teacher as a target for recruitment. The data did, however, permit description of E.D. teachers in the Grant Wood AEA service area. The second strand, which considered attrition of teachers, provided data on the high (42 percent) attrition over a three-year period of time. It seems likely that the dissatisfaction items "tired of hassles with the administration", "inconsistent support staff", "clerical and paper work", and "lack of recognition for a job well done" are viable factors in attrition and burnout. It is interesting to note that this study extends and supports the literature by emphasizing the fact that teachers derive satisfaction from student relationships and student growth. The dissatisfactions represent external variables that can interfere with teachers carrying out their perceived role or task. The data provides information for administrators who wish to reduce attrition and "burnout" among their E.D. teaching staff. A reduction in the dissatisfactions can permit teachers to do their tasks with more satisfaction and effectiveness.

REFERENCES

Cherness, C. Recent research and theory on job stress and burnout in helping professions. Paper presented in Grand Rapids, Michigan on May 12, 1978.

Freudenberger, H.J. Staff burn-out. Journal of Social Issues, 1974, 30(1), 159-165.

Iowa Department of Public Instruction. Personnel Development Report #5100-D16161, Oct. 1979.

Lortie, D.C. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Maslach, C. Burned-out. Human Behavior, 1976, 5(9), 16-22.

McGuire, W.H. Teacher burnout. Today's Education, Nov.-Dec. 1979, 5.

Moe, D. Teacher burnout: A prescription. Today's Education, Nov.-Dec. 1979, 35-36.

Pines, H. and Kafry, D. Occupational Tedium in the Social Services. Social Work, 1978; 23(6), 499-507.

Rudloff, J.S. Descriptive profile of teachers of exceptional non-exceptional children with implications for recruitment. Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 63(3), 130-135.

Sarason, S.B. The Culture of the School and the Problems of Change, Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Scheuer, A.L. The relationship between personal attributes and effectiveness in teachers of the emotionally disturbed. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37(10), 723-731.

Scrivens, R. The big click. Today's Education, Nov.-Dec. 1979, 34-35.

Selye, Hans The Stress of Life. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Sergiovanni, T.J., Factors which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers, The Journal of Educational Administration, 5: 66-82, 1967.

Sparks, D. Teacher burnout: A teacher center tackles the issue. Today's Education, Nov.-Dec. 1979, 37-39.

Teachers under stress: Survival techniques. Entire issue of The Pointer for All Educators and Parents of Exceptional Children, 1980, 24(2), 4-94.

Warnat, W.I. Teacher stress in the middle years: Crisis vs. change. The Pointer, 1980, 24(2), 4-11.

Werner, A. Support for teachers in stress: The principal's role. The Pointer, 1980, 24(2), 54-60

GRANT WOOD
AREA EDUCATION AGENCY

Dwight G. Bode, Administrator
DIVISION OF SPECIAL EDUCATION
Myron W. Rodee, Ph.D., Director

Dear Teacher:

The Grant Wood Area Education Agency is trying to gather professional opinions from Emotional Disabilities classroom teachers in the Grant Wood area.

The purpose of this survey is to learn about the:

1. Characteristics of teachers of emotional disabilities programs.
2. Factors which relate to teachers leaving or staying with emotional disabilities programs.

This information will be most useful because it will suggest the kinds of support and assistance that will be of greatest help to teachers on the job. It will also help with teacher recruitment. Information gathered will be treated confidentially. Your questionnaire is assigned a number to help us monitor the collection of responses. Please be as frank as possible in answering the questions. Truly valid information is most helpful in improving service to emotional disabilities classroom teachers.

We will appreciate it if you will complete the enclosed questionnare, refold it so our address is visible, staple, and return it within a week. Completing the questionnaire should not take more than 30 minutes.

Each participant will receive a summary of the results of the study. I know teachers are bored with paperwork, but we hope this will be interesting to do, and we believe you'll find it interesting to know how your professional colleages feel about these findings, too

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Gary M. Lawrenson
Career Education Consultant
ED Team

GL/mb
Enclosure

4401 SIXTH STREET SW, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52404 319/399-6700

ED CLASSROOM TEACHER SURVEY

I. Personal Data

a. Age: _____ 21-25 _____ 26-30 _____ 31-35 _____ 36-40

_____ 41-45 _____ 46-50 _____ 51-55 _____ 56-60

b. Sex: _____ Male _____ Female

II. Experience

a. Teaching Experience:

	Type of Classroom (SCI, SCC, RTP, Regular)	Classroom Location (regular school, isolated)	Number of Years
1.			
2.			
3.			

b. Other Experience - Please list any jobs or volunteer work which you think contributed to your skills as an ED teacher, i.e., teacher aide, house parents, case worker, etc.

	Job Title or Position	Type of Setting	Number of Years
1.			
2.			
3.			

Survey
Page 2

III. Training

a. Degree (check) B.A. ___ B.S. ___ M.A. ___ Ed.S. ___ Ph.D. ___ Other _____

Teaching Certificates Obtained

b. Undergraduate degree major _____ _____
minor _____ _____
Graduate degree major _____ _____
minor _____ _____

c. Did you have a practicum in an ED classroom? Yes ___ No ___
Length (sem., qtr., summer session) ___ _____
Kind of classroom _____
Was it an "on-the-job" practicum? Yes ___ No ___

d. How well do you think your education prepared you to teach in an ED classroom?
very well ___ pretty well ___ so-so ___ less than desirable ___

e. How realistic were your expectations in regard to the responsibilities you had in your ED classroom?
very ___ quite ___ partly ___ a little ___ not even close ___

f. Rate the areas of training which you felt were most helpful to you with the number 1 being most helpful and 7 being least helpful.

___ Assessment ___ Teacher consultation ___ Teaching curriculum
___ Parent involvement ___ Curriculum development ___ Other
___ Use of support personnel ___ Behavioral management ___ Other

g. In which of the following areas do you think you needed more training?

___ None ___ Assessment ___ Teaching curriculum
___ Parent Involvement ___ Teacher consultation ___ Behavioral management
___ Use of support personnel ___ Curriculum development ___ Other _____

h. Other Training - Please list specific content of inservices, workshops, conferences, or other activities you believe were helpful to you.

_____
_____
_____
_____

IV. (Omit this question if you're still working at your original ED classroom in the Grant Wood AEA.)
Below are possible reasons for leaving a job. Please rank in order of importance the reasons you left the job. Use the number one to designate the reason which most contributed. Leave blank those reasons which had no effect on your leaving the job.

____ Move farther from or closer to family or home	____ Desire to raise children or preganancy
____ Move with spouse or to be near a friend	____ Better or different job opportunity
____ Tired of hassles with students	____ Better paying position
____ Fear of assault by student	____ Poor facilities
____ Tired of hassles with administration	____ Not enough money to run program
____ Tired of hassles with students' parents	____ Other

V. Job Support Services

Grant Wood Area Education Agency attempts to provide support services through an ED Team of psychologists, social workers, consultants, recreation and career education people, etc. Generally, how would you rate the quality of services you receive(d)?

Excellent ____ Good ____ Average ____ Poor ____ Very bad ____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

Do you think there are/were too many support people involved in your classroom?

Yes ____ No ____

Do you think there is/was enough support service from the ED Team?

Yes ____ No ____

What changes would you suggest for the ED Team in relation to your classroom?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Survey
Page 4

VI. Which of these theories/techniques of teaching or behavior change have you incorporated into your own teaching style or method? Put a V by those you place greatest value in, an M for those you know but use only moderately, an R for any you've rejected as useless to you, or a DK for any you are not familiar with.

Comments

_____ Behavior Modification _____

_____ Social Learning Theory _____

_____ Direct Instruction (Engelmann et al) _____

_____ Rational Emotive Therapy (RET, Ellis) _____

_____ Transactional Analysis (TA) _____

_____ Values Clarification (Simon et al) _____

_____ Teacher Effectiveness Training (TET, Gordon) _____

_____ Engineered Classroom (Hewitt) _____

_____ Human Relations Training Techniques (Gazda et al) _____

_____ Group Dynamics Concepts _____

_____ Task Analysis _____

_____ Precision Teaching (Lindsley et al) _____

_____ Natural/Logical Consequencing _____

_____ Others _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

VII. Job Satisfactions

a. Listed below are possible reasons for job satisfaction. Please rank those that brought satisfaction to you by using the number one to indicate the highest satisfaction. Leave blank those items which didn't give you satisfaction.

	Comments
_____ relationships with students	_____
_____ parent contact	_____
_____ staff interraction	_____
_____ income	_____
_____ administrative support	_____
_____ lack of administrative support	_____
_____ self-achievement on job	_____
_____ flexibility of scheduling and activities	_____
_____ inflexibility of scheduling and activities	_____
_____ summer and holiday vacations	_____
_____ recognition for a job well done	_____
_____ lack of recognition for a job well done	_____
_____ consistent support staff	_____
_____ inconsistent support staff	_____
_____ reliable and effective teacher aide	_____
_____ unreliable or ineffective teacher aide	_____
_____ other	_____

b. If any of the items above caused dissatisfaction, please rank them using D1, D2, D3, etc., with D1 as the most dissatisfactory.

STRUCTURED TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

NAME:_____ PHONE:_____

ADDRESS:_____

I. JOB SATISFACTIONS

In relation to job satisfactions, many people listed three items as most satisfying. They are:

A. Relationships with students.

B. Self-achievement on job.

C. Staff interaction

We would like to get some clarification of what these items mean to you. How was/were (A, B, C) a satisfaction to you?

II. JOB DISSATISFACTORS

In relation to job dissatisfactors, many people listed four items as most dissatisfying. They are:

A. Lack of administrative support.
   1. Can you tell me the position of the administration?
   2. What do you mean by lack of support?
   3. Do you have some suggestions to improve support to you?

B. Inconsistent support staff.
   1. What support staff do you mean?
   2. What do you mean by inconsistent support staff?
   3. Do you have some suggestions to improve this situation?

C. Clerical and paper work.
   1. What clerical and paper work do you mean?
   2. What is it about clerical and paper work that causes dissatisfaction to you?

(2)

Job Dissatisfactors, Cont'd.

D. Lack of recognition for a job well done.

1. Who would you like more recognition from?

2. How would you like the recognition to occur?

III. REASONS FOR LEAVING

On your survey you checked _____ as the reason for leaving. Can you expand on that?

Over the past three years, about 1/3 of the E.D. teachers that we surveyed have left those positions. Why do you remain teaching in an E.D. classroom?

Are there any other comments you'd like to make about the survey, on teaching E.D., or anything else?